



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

obvious merits of an exceedingly valuable monograph. Dr. Gras is very far from being a mere theorizer. His research work has been careful, extensive, and brilliantly productive. His appendices, which occupy almost half his book, bear adequate testimony to this fact, as does his bibliography of sources. Research students in English economic history have good reason to be eternally grateful to him for revealing the wealth of material in the English Port Books which he has, apparently, been the first student to exploit. Scarcely less illuminating has been his work in the records of the city of London and in the archives of the various London companies. His statistics on the export and import of corn from the various English ports during the period from 1550 to 1700 (Appendices C, D, E) are invaluable, though they are probably incomplete. His corn prices for London in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries (Appendix E) supply a grave omission in Thorold Rogers' *History of Agriculture and Prices*. The other *pièces justificatives* which he prints are also valuable additions to the meager supply of accessible sources on the subject, though he might perhaps have omitted the document which he gives in Appendix J since it appeared in full in the *English Historical Review* a little while ago.

Numerous other instances could be adduced to illustrate the careful scholarship which pervades the whole book, but these will serve to establish the fact that it does great credit to the author, already favorably known by his able articles on the Customs Revenue and the Corn Bounty. Incidentally this latest addition to the Harvard Economic Studies bears testimony once more to the inspiring genius of Professor Gay who has prompted so much excellent work in the field of economic history.

CONYERS READ

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Scientific Management and Labor. By R. F. HOXIE. New York: Appleton, 1915. 8vo pp. x+302. \$1.50 net.

So far as the writer is aware this book is the first of its kind, since it presents for the first time an evaluation of scientific management, so called, from the viewpoint of a trained economist who has had an unusual opportunity to study these new methods at first hand and as they exist in actual operation. Professor Hoxie is so well known as a student of labor problems that the book will no doubt be read with interest by economists; but it is of greater importance to managers of indus-

try and should command their close attention. It is a most important addition to the literature of this much-debated subject.

The subject-matter of the book is based upon an investigation of scientific management in its relation to labor made by Professor Hoxie for the United States Commission on Industrial Relations. It has to do, therefore, with this phase of the question only, and is not a treatise on efficiency systems. It is, in fact, as the author states, an attempt to test the claims of the late Frederick W. Taylor respecting scientific management in its relation to labor. The claims of other leaders in the efficiency movement, such as Mr. Gantt and Mr. Emerson, are considered in so far as they differ from those advanced by Mr. Taylor.

The subject-matter of the book is divided into three sections as follows: Part I, "Viewpoint and Method"; Part II, "Critical Examination of Scientific Management in Its Relation to Labor"; Appendices: (I) "Conclusions Resulting from the Investigation"; (II) "The Labor Claims of Scientific Management according to Mr. Taylor"; (III) "The Labor Claims of Scientific Management according to Mr. Gantt"; (IV) "The Labor Claims of Scientific Management according to Mr. Emerson"; (V) "The Trade Union Objections to Scientific Management"; (VI) "Vital Points at Issue between Scientific Management and Labor Based upon the Claims of Scientific Managers"; (VII) "Vital Points at Issue between Scientific Management and Labor Based upon Trade Union Objections to Scientific Management"; (VIII) Questionnaire: "Scientific Management and Labor."

In taking up the investigation Mr. Hoxie first made a study of scientific management as presented by its leading advocates. All the important literature bearing on both sides of the question was examined and representatives on both sides of the controversy were consulted. With this as a basis two preliminary statements were prepared entitled, respectively, "The Labor Claims of Scientific Management" and "Trade Union Objections to Scientific Management." The first of these documents was submitted to prominent scientific managers for criticism and revision, while the second was revised and approved by a committee of the American Federation of Labor. From these official statements the vital questions at issue were determined and these are set forth in Appendices VI and VII noted in the foregoing. The questionnaire, Appendix VIII, was compiled from these documents and used as a means of securing extended information from both employers and employees. The investigating committee visited a large number of shops where scientific management has been installed, in whole or in

part, and also consulted many individuals concerning the problem. It will be seen, therefore, that the appendices are important documents, for aside from any conclusions that have been drawn by Mr. Hoxie, Appendices VI and VII show in a clear and concise form the points at issue, while Appendix VIII, which is quite voluminous, gives one an idea of the complexity and extent of the controversy.

The conclusions of Mr. Hoxie and his committee, however, are of great importance. It may be well to quote directly from the report itself which states:

Two essential points stand forth. The first point is that scientific management, at its best and adequately applied, exemplifies one of the advanced stages of the industrial revolution which began with the invention and introduction of machinery. Because of its youth and the necessary application of its principles to a competitive state of industry, it is, in many respects, crude, many of its devices are contradictory of its announced principles, and it is inadequately scientific. Nevertheless, it is to date the latest word in the sheer mechanics of production and inherently in line with the march of events.

The second point is that neither organized nor unorganized labor finds in scientific management any adequate protection to its standards of living, any progressive means for industrial education, or any opportunity for industrial democracy by which labor may create for itself a progressively efficient share in efficient management. And, therefore, as unorganized labor is totally unequipped to work for these human rights, it becomes doubly the duty of organized labor to work unceasingly and unswervingly for them, and, if necessary, to combat an industrial development which not only does not contain conditions favorable to their growth, but, in many respects, is hostile soil.

Mr. Hoxie's findings verify what the writer has long contended, namely, that scientific management at its very best is essentially a means of increasing productive capacity and does not carry with it a single regulative principle that automatically tends to protect the individual worker against certain results that ensue from its introduction exactly like those that follow the introduction of labor-saving machinery.

In common with all methods looking to increased results in productive effort, these methods *make possible* better conditions for the race as a whole. But experience with labor-saving machinery has made it clear that the distribution of the benefits flowing from improved methods cannot be left to chance, since these methods themselves afford no protection to the worker during the period of readjustment following the introduction of more economic methods.

The need of taking advantage of every economic gain is undoubted, and the human race, in general, never discards any ways or means to

this end. The great problem, therefore, is to develop these methods while at the same time safeguarding human rights, and the writer agrees with Mr. Hoxie that this cannot be safely left to scientific management, which depends on personal good-will to correct abuses that may result because of its introduction.

Mr. Hoxie's discussion in Parts I and II is most illuminating and is literally filled with interesting conclusions. Space will permit the mention of a few of these only. He questions frankly the claims made by exponents of scientific management that these new methods are *scientifically* accurate. In referring to time study, for instance, he states that "far from being the invariable and purely objective matters that they are pictured the methods and results of time study and task setting are in practice the special sport of individual judgment and opinion, subject to all the possibilities of diversity, inaccuracy and injustice that arise from human ignorance and prejudice." While this statement may be considered overstrong by some, there is no doubt but that Mr. Hoxie is right in the main. Time study is not and cannot be an exact science.

More important, however, is his criticism of the basis of advanced wage systems. Granting that it is possible to measure accurately the task a worker ought to perform, the claim that these advanced wage methods reward a worker in proportion to his effort is, as Mr. Hoxie points out, begging the question so long as these systems use the rates already determined by competition as a basis for efficiency reward, since these very base rates are in dispute.

The most interesting and in some respects the most important part of the book is the discussion of scientific management methods as the investigator found them in actual practice. On the whole, this part of the discussion is not overfavorable to scientific management, and is open to the criticism that these conclusions have been deduced from personal opinions rather than from actual personal knowledge of the new methods. But in justice to Mr. Hoxie it must be added that he notes that most of the shortcomings of scientific management are not inherent in the system but are the result often of ignorance on the part of those who are introducing these new and as yet poorly understood methods. He concludes that we need more thorough study and general publicity concerning the true character and methods of scientific management and concerning the real character, intelligence, and spirit of those engaged in its application, and to this statement all who have examined this difficult problem with an unbiased mind will certainly agree.

DEXTER S. KIMBALL